|  **Notice Date** | **Case Number** | **Court** | **Case Name Summary of Issue** | **Fairness Hearing Date** | **For more information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **9-1-2017** | **15-CV-01973** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Sheri Dodge, Neil Dodge, Ram Agrawal and Sarita Agrawal v. PHH Corp., et al.****Re Defendants: Realogy Holdings Corp., Realogy Group LLC, Realogy Company, Equity Title Company, TRG Services Escrow, Inc., NRT LLC, Realogy Services Group LLC, and Realogy Services Venture Partner LLC**The Plaintiffs claimed that borrowers who closed on a mortgage loan with the PHH Defendants or the PHH Home Loans Defendants during the Class Period were improperly referred for title, escrow, and closing-related services to Title Resource Group LLC or its affiliates (who are among the Realogy Defendants) in exchange for certain things of value and that this practice violated the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (“RESPA”), 12 U.S.C. § 2607, et seq. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write, call, fax or e-mail:****DANIEL S. ROBINSON** **WESLEY K. POLISCHUK** **ROBINSON CALCAGNIE, INC.****19 Corporate Plaza Drive****Newport Beach, CA 92660****949 720-1288 (Ph.)****949 720-1292 (Fax)****drobinson@robinsonfirrn.com****wpolishuk@robinsonfirrn.com** |
| **9-1-2017** | **14-CV-01606** | **(D.S.C.)** | **Epstein v. World Acceptance Corporation, et al.****Re Defendants: A. Alexander McLean, III, John L. Calmes, Jr., Kelly M. Malson, and Mark C. Roland**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated §§ 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by issuing false and misleading statements or failing to disclose material adverse facts about the Company’s business, operations, and prospects, including that the Company’s loan practices did not comply with the Consumer Financial Protection Act and/or the Truth in Lending Act and that the Company lacked adequate internal and financial controls. Lead Plaintiff further alleges that as a result of Defendants’ false and misleading statements and omissions, World Acceptance’s stock traded at artificially inflated prices during the Class Period. | **12-18-2017**Prepared by Brenda Berkley | **For more information write to:****ROBBINS GELLER** **RUDMAN & DOWD LLP****ELLEN GUSIKOFF STEWART****655 West Broadway****Suite 1900****San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **9-1-2017** | **16-CV-00435** | **(W.D. Mo.)** | **Mamdooh Husein v. Bravo Brio Restaurant Group, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that Brio Restaurant Group, Inc. pay practices violated state law and the Fair Labor Standards Act and various state wage and hour laws. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Eric L. Dirks****Williams Dirks Dameron LLC****1100 Main Street, Suite 2600****Kansas City, MO 64105****816 876-2600 (Ph.)** |
| **9-1-2017** | **14-CV-4107****14-CV-4658****14-CV-04936** | **(E.D.N.Y.)****(E.D. Pa.)****(Sup. Ct. N.J.)** | **McLaughlin v. IDT Energy, Inc.****Ferrare v. IDT Energy, Inc.****Aks v.IDT Energy, Inc.**Plaintiffs allege that the company overcharged customers for gas and electricity, and also did not provide the full amount of rebates customers were owed under IDT’s rebate programs. The lawsuit alleges that IDT breached its contracts with customers and its duty of good faith and fair dealing, and also violated various consumer fraud laws. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Matthew R. Mendelsohn****Mazie Slater Katz &** **Freeman, LLC****103 Eisenhower Parkway****Roseland, NJ 07068** |
| **9-1-2017** | **14-CV-01680** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Shankar v. Imperva, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Shlomo Kramer, and Terrence J. Schmid**Plaintiff allegesthat Defendants violated Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and that the Individual Defendants violated Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act, in connection with statements concerning Imperva’s success in competing against International Business Machines Corporation (“IBM”). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Robbins Geller Rudman** **& Dowd LLP****Douglas R. Britton****655 West Broadway****Suite 1900****San Diego, CA 92101** |
| **9-1-2017** | **14-CV-0821** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Echevarria v. Bank of America Corporation, et al.****Re Defendants: National Association and FIA Card Services, N.A.**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to update credit reporting information for credit card accounts sold to third parties where the accountholder’s debts were discharged in Chapter 7 bankruptcy after they were sold. As a result, the trade lines continued to reflect that the debts were sold, charged off, and $0 balance, and did not indicate that the debts were included in bankruptcy. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****BOIES SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP****George Carpinello****30 South Pearl Street****Albany, NY 12207****518 434-0600 (Ph.)****Attention: Annabel Felton** |
| **9-5-2017** | **15-CV-462** | **(M.D.N.C.)** | **Danielle Seaman v. Duke University and Duke University Health System, et al.**Plaintiff alleges that the No-Hire Agreement violates state and federal antitrust laws, and resulted in suppressed mobility and compensation of certain employees of Duke and UNC.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information call or fax:****Dean M. Harvey****415 956-1000 (Ph.)****415 956-1008 (Fax)** |
| **9-7-2017** | **16-CV-4232** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **In re: Wheaton Franciscan ERISA Litigation****Re Defendants: Wheaton Franciscan Services, Inc. d/b/a Wheaton Franciscan Healthcare, Wheaton Franciscan System Retirement Plan Committee** Plaintiff alleges that Defendants denied Employee Retirement Income Security Act (“ERISA”) protections to the participants and beneficiaries of the Plan, a defined benefit pension plan sponsored by Wheaton and, subsequently, Ascension Health, by incorrectly claiming that the Plan qualifies as an ERISA-exempt “church plan.” The complaints further allege that asserting this exemption caused Defendants to deny Plan participants the protections of ERISA.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.cohenmilstein.com/wheaton-settlement**](http://www.cohenmilstein.com/wheaton-settlement)[**www.kellersettlements.com**](http://www.kellersettlements.com) |
| **9-7-2017** | **12-CV-08388****15-CV-02140****15-CV-08831** |  | **Omar Vargas, Robert Bertone, Michelle Harris, and Sharon Heberling****Klipfel, et al. v. Ford Motor Company****Cusick, et al. v. Ford Motor Company**Plaintiffs allege that certain Ford Focus and Fiesta vehicles are equipped with defective PowerShift Dual-Clutch Automatic (DPS6) Transmissions (“PowerShift Transmission”) that may slip, buck, kick, or jerk, and result in sudden or delayed vehicle acceleration. | **10-2-2017** | **For more information visit or call:**[**www.FordTransmissionSettlement.com**](http://www.FordTransmissionSettlement.com)**844 540-6011 (Ph.)** |
| **9-7-2017** | **16-CV-58** | **(D. Md.)** | **James Williams, et al. v. CoreLogic rental Property Solutions, LLC**The lawsuit alleges that CoreLogic Rental Property Solutions, LLC (“RPS”) violated the Fair Credit Reporting Act (“FCRA”) by willfully: (1) failing to provide the class members with a complete copy of all information in their consumer file upon request by failing to identify the entity that had provided the criminal record(s) to RPS; and (2) listing the following phrases on file disclosures: “Statewide Criminal Search Report by Crimcheck America,” “Multistate Criminal Search Report by Crimcheck America,” or “Sex Offender Search Report by Crimcheck America.”  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****Kristi C. Kelly****Andrew Guzzo****Kelly & Crandall, PLC****3925 Chain Bridge Road****Suite 202****Fairfax, VA 22030****703 424-7576 (Ph.)****703 591-0167 (Fax)** |
| **9-8-2017** | **10-CV-01811** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Sony PS3 “Other OS” Litigation**The Lawsuit claims that disabling the Other OS functionality in Fat PS3s through a firmware update constituted an unfair and unlawful business practice and false advertising. The lawsuit seeks recovery of monetary damages to compensate Fat PS3 purchasers for the loss of the Other OS feature and functionality. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or fax:****James Pizzirusso****Hausfeld LLP****1700 K Street N.W.** **Suite 650****Washington, D.C. 20006****202 540-7200 (Ph.)****202 540-7201 (Fax)** |
| **9-8-2017** | **13-MD-02493** | **(N.D.W. Va.)** | **In re: Monitronics Internatinal, Inc., Telephone Consumer Protection Act Litigation**Plaintiffs allege that, on or after 5-18- 2007, Monitronics violated the TelephoneConsumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) when Monitronics, its Authorized Dealers, or an Authorized Dealer’s lead generator or sub-dealer made telemarketing calls to cell phones through the use of an automatic telephone dialing system, or an artificial or prerecorded voice to residential phones through the use of an artificial or prerecorded voice, and to telephone numbers that were listed on the National Do-Not-Call Registry. The Plaintiffs further allege that Monitronics, its Authorized Dealers, or an Authorized Dealer’s lead generator or sub-dealer did not have the recipients’ permission to make these calls. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Bailey & Glasser, LLP****Jonathan R. Marshall****209 Capitol Street****Charleston, WV 25301****304 345-6555 (Ph.)****304 342-1110 (Fax)****Jmarshall@baileyglasser.com** |
| **9-8-2017** | **15-CV-04198** | **(N.D. Ga.)** | **Sharon Crosby v. Core-Mark Distributors, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to provide copies of consumer reports to Class Members prior to taking adverse action against them in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1681b (b)(3)(A)(i); and, failed to provide individuals with a written description of their rights under the Fair Credit Reporting Act prior to taking adverse action against them in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(3)(A)(ii). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****James A. Francis** **FRANCIS & MAILMAN, P.C.** **Land Title Building****Suite 1902** **100 South Broad Street** **Philadelphia, PA 19110** **215 735-6000 (Ph.)**  |
| **9-11-2017** | **15-MD-2599****14-CV-24009** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **In re: Takata Airbag Products Liability Litigation****Re Defendants: Honda Motor Co., Ltd., American Honda Motor Co., Inc., Honda of America Mfg., Inc., and Honda R&D Co., Ltd.**Plaintiff alleges that certain automotive companies, including Honda, manufactured,distributed, or sold certain vehicles containing allegedly defective Takata airbaginflators manufactured by Defendants Takata Corporation and TK Holdings, Inc. that allegedly could, upon deployment, rupture and expel debris or shrapnel into the occupant compartment and/or otherwise affect the airbag’s deployment, and that the plaintiffs sustained economic losses as a result thereof. | **2-7-2018** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Peter Prieto****PODHURST ORSECK, P.A.****SunTrust International** **Center****One S.E. 3rd Avenue****Suite 2700****Miami, Florida 33131****305 358-2800 (Ph.)****pprieto@podhurst.com** |
| **9-11-2017** | **16-CV-01678** | **(E.D. Wis.)** | **George et al. v. CNH Health & Welfare Benefit Plan et al.****Re Defendants: Blue Cross Blue Shield of Wisconsin d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield, CNH Health & Welfare Plan n/k/a CNH Industrial U.S. Health & Welfare Plan, CNH Employee Group Insurance Plan (effective 1-1-2009) (the “CNH Plan”), and Case New Holland, Inc., n/k/a Case New Holland Industrial, Inc., (“CNH”) (collectively, the “Defendants”)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants underpaid claims for medical services rendered by Out-Of-Network Providers, i.e., physicians and other healthcare practitioners who at the time of the service did not participate in the participating provider network(s) under the terms and conditions of the CNH Plan.Plaintiffs challenge Defendants’ use of a Medicare-based methodology to determine the amount of reimbursement allowed under the CNH Plan for professional medical services provided by Out-of-Network Providers, alleging this methodology is contrary to applicable provisions of the CNH Plan. Plaintiffs allege that participants are harmed when the use of the Medicare-based methodology results inunderpayment of benefits under the CNH Plan, and that they have legal claims under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, codified in part at 29 U.S.C. § 1132 (“ERISA”). | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail:****Douglas P. Dehler****Christa Wittenberg****O’NEIL CANNON HOLLMAN DEJONG** **& LAING, S.C.****111 East Wisconsin Avenue****Milwaukee, WI 53202****414 276-5000 (Ph.)****414 276-6581 (Fax)****Doug.Dehler@wilaw.com****Christa.Wittenberg@wilaw.com** |
| **9-11-2017** | **17-CV-00053** | **(S.D. Ala.)** | **Family Medicine Pharmacy, LLC v. Impax Laboratories, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that Defendant sent unsolicited facsimile advertisements promoting goods and/or services, without prior consent or an established business relationship, in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 .S.C. § 227.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or e-mail:****Diandra S. Debrosse-** **Zimmermann****Zarzaur Mujumdar & Debrosse****2332 2nd Avenue North****Birmingham, Alabama 35203****fuli@zarzaur.com** |
| **9-11-2017** | **16-CV-00216** | **(W.D. Wash.)** | **In re: CTI BioPharma Corp. Securities Litigation**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants made material misstatements and misleading omissions about pacritinib, included in the offering documents for CTI Series N-1. During the Class Period, one of CTI’s drug candidates was “pacritinib,” a treatment for myelofibrosis, a type of blood-related cancer. Plaintiffs further allege that persons who purchased CTI Securities during the Class Period were injured when the truth was revealed. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Bernstein Litowitz Berger &** **Grossmann LLP****David R. Stickney****12481 High Bluff Drive****Suite 300****San Diego, CA 92130** |
| **9-11-2017** | **15-CV-01284** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Sherry Singer, et al. v. Postmates, Inc.**Plaintiffs claim they and other couriers who made deliveries using the Postmates app around the country have been improperly classified as independent contractors by Postmates and have sought relief under various federal and state laws, including federal minimum wage and overtime laws, as well as the laws of California, Massachusetts, New York, D.C., as well as Massachusetts expense reimbursement law. Plaintiffs have also asserted claims seeking penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 on behalf of California couriers. | **2-9-2018** | **For more information write, vist call or e-mail:****Shannon Liss-Riordan****Matthew D. Carlson****Lichten & Liss-Riordan, P.C.****466 Geary Street****Suite 201****San Francisco, CA 94102**[**www.llrlaw.com**](http://www.llrlaw.com)**617 994-5800 (Ph.)****scleary@llrlaw.com** |
| **9-13-2017** | **16-CV-03679** | **(D.N.J.)** | **Santos v. The Carrington Companies, LLC, et al.****Re Defendants: Carrington Holding Company, LLC, Carrington Mortgage Services, LLC, Carrington Insurance Agency, Telsi Insurance Agency, LLC, and Carrington Real Estate Services, LLC**This lawsuit involves lender-placed insurance (“LPI”), which is insurance (hazard, flood,flood-gap, or wind-only) that is placed on a borrower’s property to protect the borrower and mortgage lender when the borrower’s insurance policy lapses, or when the borrower does not maintain a homeowner’s insurance policy that is acceptable to the mortgage lender. When an LPI Policy is placed pursuant to the borrower’s mortgage contract, Carrington pays premiums to the LPI insurer who writes the policy, and then Carrington charges the borrowers for those mandatory premiums. | **Not set yet** | **For more inforamtion write to:****Roosevelt N. Nesmith****Law Office of** **Roosevelt N. Nesmith, LLC****363 Bloomfield Avenue****Suite 2****Montclair, New Jersey 07042** |
| **9-14-2017** | **14-CV-00443** | **(D.N.H.)** | **Levy v. Gutierrez, et al. GTAT Securities Litigation****Re Defendants: Morgan Stanley & Co. LLC, Goldman, Sachs & Co. LLC, and Canaccord Genuity Inc., (collectively “Underwriter Defendants”)**The action alleges, among other things, that during the Class Period and/or in the offering materials for the Offerings, Defendants mislead investors about the true nature, progress, and success of GTAT’s joint venture agreement with Apple for the production of Sapphire material. The action further alleges that GTAT investors suffered economic harm when the truth about the Apple agreement was revealed upon GT Advanced Technologies Inc. filing for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection on 10-6-2014. The Complaint asserted claims under § 11 of the Securities Act of 1933 (the “Securities Act”) against the Underwriter Defendants, the Director Defendants, and certain of the Officer Defendants; claims under § 12(a)(2) of the Securities Act against the Underwriter Defendants; and claims under § 15 of the Securities Act against the Director Defendants, certain of the Officer Defendants, and Apple, alleging that these Defendants were statutory liable for false and misleading statements in the offering materials for the Offerings. The Complaint also asserted claims under § 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”), and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder, against certain of the Officer Defendants; and claims under § 20(a) of the Exchange Act against the Officer Defendants and Apple. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Bernstein Litowitz Berger**  **& Grossmann LLP****John C. Browne****1251 Avenue of the Americas****44th Floor****New York, NY 10020** |
| **9-15-2017** | **12-CV-00729** | **(E.D.N.C.)** | **Speaks, et al. v. US Tobacco Cooperative**The lawsuit claims, among other things, that: (1) U.S. Tobacco accumulated reserve funds over the years through members who may now claim portions of those funds; (2) the purpose for which U.S. Tobacco was created no longer exists, so it should be dissolved and its assets distributed; and (3) U.S. Tobacco acted unfairly in trying to eliminate some members’ equity interests. | **1-19-2017** | **For more information visit:**[**WWW.FLUECUREDTOBACCOSETTLEMENT.COM**](http://WWW.FLUECUREDTOBACCOSETTLEMENT.COM) |
| **9-15-2017** | **14-CV-02516** | **(D. Conn.)** | **In re: Aggrenox Antitrust Litigation****Re Defendants: Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co. KG, Boehringer Ingelheim International GmbH (collectively, “Boehringer”), Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., Teva Pharmaceutical Industries, Ltd., Barr Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (n/k/a/ Bar Pharmaceuticals, LLC), Barr Laboratories Inc., Duramed Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (n/k/a/ Barr Pharmaceuticals, LLC), Barr Laboratories Inc., Duramed Pharmaceuticals, Inc.(n/k/a/ Teva Women’s Health Inc.), and Duramed Pharmaceutical Sales Corp. (n/k/a/ Teva Sales and Marketing, Inc.) (collectively “Teva”) (together, Defendants)**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated federal antitrust laws by engaging in an unlawful scheme to delay or block the market entry of less expensive, generic versions of Aggrenox®. The Direct Purchaser Class Plaintiffs allege that Boehringer entered into several unlawful, non-competition agreements, or horizontal market allocation agreements, with its prospective generic competitor, Barr, whereby Boehringer agreed to pay Barr, in exchange for agreements by Barr to delay selling its generic version of Aggrenox. After the challenged agreements were entered into, Barr was acquired by Teva. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call fax or visit:****Bruce E. Gerstein, Esq.****Garwin Gerstein & Fisher LLP****88 Pine Street, 10th Floor****New York, NY 10005****212 398-0055 (Ph.)****212-764-6620 (Fax)**[**www.garwingerstein.com**](http://www.garwingerstein.com) |
| **9-15-2017** | **12-CV-97** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **Tyron Henderson, et al. v. CoreLogic National Background Data, LLC, et al.**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants failed to notify class members when it furnished a consumer report containing adverse public record information from a reseller entity, and ultimately resold the report to a class member’s prospective employer, without the required notice because the Defendant did not maintain strict procedures designed to insure that the public record information that it reported about Plaintiff was complete and up to date. Plaintiff alleges that this conduct was uniform as to all of the class members and that it violated Section 1681k (a). | **1-24-2018** | **For more inforamtion write to:****Leonard A. Bennett****Consumer Litigation** **Associates, P.C.****763 J. Clyde Morris Blvd.****Suite 1A****Newport News, VA 23601** |
| **9-15-2017** | **15-CV-386** | **(E.D. Va.)** | **Carolyn Witt v. CoreLogic National Background Data, LLC, et al.**See page 5 CAFA notice above for more information. | **1-24-2018** | **For more information write to:****Leonard A. Bennett****Consumer Litigation** **Associates, P.C.****763 J. Clyde Morris Blvd.****Suite 1A****Newport News, VA 23601** |
| **9-15-2017** | **16-CV-25237** | **(S.D. Fla.)** | **Strickland, et al. v. Carrington Mortgage Services, LLC, et al.**Plaintiffs allege that when a borrower was required to have insurance for property pursuant to a residential mortgage or home equity loan or line of credit, and evidence of acceptable coverage was not provided, Fay would place Lender Placed Insurance (“LPI”) in a manner such that Fay allegedly received an unauthorized benefit. Plaintiffs allege further that Fay did so primarily to receive other consideration from the Insurer Defendants. Plaintiffs also allege that the way in which LPI policies were obtained and placed caused the premiums and the amount of coverage to be excessive. Also see page 9 above. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Adam M. Moskowitz****Kozyak, Tropin, &**  **Throckmorton, LLP****2525 Ponce de Leon Blvd.****9th Floor****Coral Gables, FL 33134** |
| **9-15-2017** | **13-CV-00644** | **(S.D. Cal.)** | **Kellgren, et al. v. Petco Animal Supplies, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants:** **Petco Animal Supplies, Inc., Petco Holdings, Inc., Petco Holdings, Inc. LLC, and Petco Animal Supplies Stores, Inc. (together “Petco”)** Former Petco Assistant Managers (“AMs”) suedPetco alleging that they were not paid overtime for hours worked over 40 in a workweek. The AMs claim that they are owed money under the federal Fair Labor Standards Act and/or the state laws of Colorado, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, and Pennsylvania.  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****HEPWORTH GERSHBAUM & ROTH,** **PLLC****David A. Roth****Marc Hepworth****Charles Gershbaum****Rebecca S. Predovan****192 Lexington Avenue****Suite 802****New York, NY 10016****212 545-1199 (Ph.)** |
| **9-18-2017** | **15-CV-12730** | **(D. Mass.)** | **In re Asacol Antitrust Litigation – Direct Purchaser****Re Defendants: Allergan, Plc (f/k/a/ Actavis, Plc), Allergan, Inc., Allergan USA, Inc., Allergan Sales, LLC Warner Chilcott (US), LLC, and Warner Chilcott Sales (US), LLC** Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants violated federal antitrust laws by unlawfully impairing the introduction of generic versions of the prescription drugs Asacol, Asacol HD, and Delzicol into the United States market. Plaintiffs argue that this alleged conduct suppressed or eliminated competition that the Defendants would have faced from generic competitors. The Plaintiffs further claim that Class Members were injured as a result of the Defendants’ acts by paying more for AsacolHD and/or Delzicol than they would have paid otherwise and/or by being unable to purchase less expensive, generic versions of Asacol.Asacol HD, and/or Delzicol. As a result, the Plaintiffs claim that Class Members were overcharged for Asacol HD and/or Delzicol. | **12-7-2017** | **For more information write, call or visit:****Thomas M. Sobol****Lauren Guth Barnes****Hagens Berman Sobol**  **Shapiro LLP****55 Cambridge Parkway Suite 301****Cambridge, MA 02142****617 482-3700 (Ph.)**[**www.hbsslaw.com**](http://www.hbsslaw.com) |
| **9-18-2017** | **14-CV-03264** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **In re: Capacitors Antitrust Litigation**The lawsuit alleges that Defendants and co-conspirators conspired to raise and fix the prices of Capacitors for more than ten years, resulting in overcharges to indirect purchasers of Capacitors. The complaint describes how the Defendants and co-conspirators allegedly violated the U.S. and state antitrust, unfair competition, and consumer protection laws by agreeing to fix prices and restrict output of Capacitors by, among other things, face-to-face meetings and other communications, customer allocation, and the use of trade associations. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Steven N. Williams****Cotchett, Pitre &**  **McCarthy, LLP****San Francisco Airport** **Office Center****840 Malcolm Road****Suite 200****Burlingame, CA 94010** |
| **9-21-2017** | **14-CV-00443** | **(D.N.H.)** | **Levy v. Gutierrez, et al. GTAT Securities Litigation****Re Defendants: Morgan Stanley & Co. LLC, Goldman, Sachs & Co. LLC, and Canaccord Genuity Inc., (collectively “Underwriter Defendants”)**For more information see page 10 above. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Bernstein Litowitz Berger**  **& Grossmann LLP****John C. Browne****1251 Avenue of the Americas****44th Floor****New York, NY 10020** |
| **9-21-2017** | **14-CV-596** | **(S.D. Ill.)** | **Dr. Robert L. Meinders, D.C. Ltd. v. The Emery Wilson Corporation d/b/a Sterling Management Systems**Plaintiff alleges that the Defendant violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act and various state laws by sending unsolicited advertisements by fax. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Phillip A. Bock****Bock, Hatch, Lewis &**  **Oppenheim, LLC****134 N. LaSalle Street****Suite 1000****Chicago, IL 60602** |
| **9-22-2017** | **15-CV-5132** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **In re: Braskem Securities Litigation, and Carlos Fadigas**Plaintiff alleges that Draskem’s executives, made materially false and misleading statements and omissions to investors concerning, among other things, an alleged bribery scheme affecting the price at which Braskem purchased naphtha from Petroleo Brasileiro S.A. (“Petrobras”).  | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Cohen Milstein Sellers &**  **Toll PLLC****Steven J. Toll****1100 New Yrk Avenue, N.W.****Suite 500****Washington, D.C. 20005** |
| **9-22-2017** | **15-CV-01048** | **(M.D. Tenn.)** | **Rodriguez, et al. v. Providence Community Corrections, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Rutherford County, Tennessee, Providence Community Corrections, Inc., now known as Pathways Community Corrections, Inc., Jasmine Jackson, Briana Woodlee, Amanda Roberts, Tiarra Smith, and Nisha Hyde**Plaintiffs allege that Rutherford County contracted with Pathways Community Corrections (“PCC”) to provide private probation services to individuals on probation in Rutherford County. The lawsuit alleges that PCC and other defendants extorted illegal fees from individuals on probation. The Named Plaintiffs purport to represent a class of individuals who, at any time from 10-1-2011 to the [Preliminary Approval Order date] incurred court imposed financial obligations arising from a traffic or misdemeanor case in Rutherford County General Sessions or Circuit Court, and were supervised on probation in that case by PCC or Rutherford County’sProbation Department. The lawsuit alleges violations of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (civil RICO statutes), other federal and state statutes, the due process and equal protection rights under the U.S. Constitution, and the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.The lawsuit also alleges abuse of process. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write or call:****Elizabeth Rossi****Civil Rights Corps****910 17th Street NW****Suite 500****Washington, DC 20006****202 599-0953 (Ph.)** |
| **9-25-2017** | **15-CV-01698** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Cohen v. Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor Agency, et al.****Re Defendants: San Joaquin Hills Transportation Corridor Agency**Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681c(g)(1) by willfully, knowingly, or recklessly printing debit and credit card transaction receipts that revealed more than the last five digits of the debit and credit card account numbers used in the transaction. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, e-mail or call:****Jeff S. Westerman****WESTERMAN LAW CORP.****1875 Century Park E. Suite 2200****Los Angeles, CA 90067****jwesterman@jswlegal.com****310 698-7450 (Ph.)** |
| **9-25-2017** | **12-MD-02311****13-CV-00903****13-CV-01103****13-CV-02203****15-CV-03003** | **(E.D. Mich.)** | **In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation****End-Payor (“EPPs”)****Windshield Wiper Systems Action****Fuel Injection Systems****Spark Plugs, Oxygen Sensors, and Air Fuel Ratio Sensors Action****Re Defendants: Robert Bosch LLC and Robert Bosch GmbH**The lawsuits claim that the Defendants in each lawsuit agreed to unlawfully raise the price of certain motor vehicle component parts. As a result, dealers of Trucks and/or Equipment who purchased for resale or lease Trucks and/or Equipment containing those parts or who indirectly purchased those parts as replacement parts, which were manufactured or sold by a Defendant or any subsidiary, affiliate, or alleged co-conspirator of a Defendant may have paid more than they should have. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call, fax or e-mail****:****Terrell W. Oxford****Chanler A. Langham****Omar Ochoa****SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.****1000 Louisiana Street****Suite 5100****Houston, TX 77002****713 651-9366 (Ph.)****713 654-6666 (Fax)****toxford@susmangodfrey.com****clangham@susmangodfrey.com****oochoa@susmangodfrey.com** |
| **9-25-2017** | **14-CV-8461****16-CV-8677** | **(N.D. Ill.)** | **Snyder, et al. v. Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC****Beecroft v. Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC**Plaintiffs allege that Ocwen violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act by using an automatic telephone dialing system to call cell phones without the prior express consent of the recipients. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Beth E. Terrell****Adrienne D. McEntee****Terrell Marshall Law Group,**  **PLLC****936 N. 34th Street****Suite 300****Seattle, WA 98103** |
| **9-25-2017** | **14-CV-0522** | **(N.D. Cal.)** | **Patel v. Trans Union LLC, et al.****Re Defendant: Trans Union Rental Screening Solutions**The lawsuit claimed that Defendants failed to comply with the federal Fair Credit Reporting Act by disclosing “Alert List” information concerning consumers who had submitted rental applications to landlords | **Not set yet** | **For more information visit:**[**www.pateltransunionclassaction.com**](http://www.pateltransunionclassaction.com) |
| **9-26-2017** | **14-CV-02081** | **(E.D. Cal.)** | **Fellen, Inc., et al. v. RehabCare Group, Inc., et al.**Plaintiff alleges Defendants violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act and various regulations promulgated by the Federal Communications Commission by sending more than 2.4 million transmissions of junk faxes to long-term care facilities throughout the country. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Beth E. Terrell****Adrienne D. McEntee****Terrell Marshall Law**  **Group, PLLC****936 N. 34th Street** **Suite 300****Seattle, WA 98103** |
| **9-26-2017** | **11-CV-5450** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Mayor & City Council of Baltimore v. Credit Suisse Group AG****Re Defendant: Barclays Bank PLC** Plaintiffs allege that Barclays and other banks manipulated the U.S. Dollar LIBOR rate, and that, as a result, purchasers did not receive as much interest payments for their U.S. Dollar LIBOR-based instruments from the banks as they should have. Plaintiffs in the OTC Action have brought (a) antitrust claims under the Sherman Act, (b) breach of contract claims, and (c) unjust enrichment claims against Barclays and the Non-Settling Defendants. | **10-23-2017** | **For more informaion call or visit:****1 888 568-7640 (Ph.)**[**www.BarclaysLiborSettlement.com**](http://www.BarclaysLiborSettlement.com) |
| **9-27-2017** | **16-CV-00295** | **(W.D. Wisc.)** | **Farnham v. Caribou Coffee Company, Inc.**Plaintiff alleges that Caribou Coffee Company sent text message advertisements by use of an “automatic telephone dialing system” without “prior express written consent” in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227. | **11-27-2017** | **For more information write to:****Get information** |
| **9-28-2017** | **15-CV-02131** | **(C.D. Cal.)** | **Hiroyuki Oda, et al. v. Wilson Sporting Goods Co.**The lawsuit claims that the 13/14 White Steels sold by Wilson were defectively designed and manufactured which caused the 13/14 White Steels to fail prematurely. Specifically, the lawsuit contends Wilson violated California and federal laws by failing to disclose the alleged defects and complying with its express warranty. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Brian D. Chase****Jerusalem F. Beligan****Bisnar | Chase LLP****1301 Dove Street****Suite 120****Newport Beach, CA 92660** |
| **9-28-2017** | **14-CV-259** | **(S.D.N.Y.)** | **Mayfield, et al. v. Asta Funding, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Palisades Collection, LLC, Gary Stern, Pressler & Pessler, LLP, Richard A. Franklin, Tin-An A. Wang, Mitchell E Zipkin, and Craig Stiller**Plaintiffs allege that Defendants acted in unlawful ways in suing people in New York City Civil Court to collect on AT&T Wireless debts.Defendants have agreed to settle the claims in the case. But they deny that they did anything wrong or violated any laws, and the Court has not decided whether they violated any laws. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write to:****Hughes Hubbard & Reed LLP****Diane E. Lifton****Meaghan C. Gragg****One Batery Park Plaza****New York, NY 10004****212 837-6000 (Ph.)****212 422-4726 (Fax)** |
| **9-29-2017** | **15-CV-13696** | **(D. Mass.)** | **Vuckovic v. KT Health Holdings, Inc. and Kt Health, LLC**Plaintiffs allege that KT Health utilized false and misleading advertising on its product packaging and marketing materials for its KT Tape Products. Plaintiffs allege putative class action claims for: (1) unjust enrichment; (2) untrue and misleading advertising under Massachusetts statute G.L. Chapter 93A, §2. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write, call or e-mail:****Pastor Law Office, LLP****Bavid Pastor****63 Atlantic Avenue****3rd Floor****Boston, MA 02110****616 742-9700 (Ph.)****dpastor@pastorlawoffice.com** |
| **9-29-2017** | **14-CV-02081** | **(E.D. Cal.)** | **Fellen, Inc., et al. v. RehabCare Group, Inc., et al.****Re Defendants: Cannon & Associates, LLC, dba Polaris Group Polaris Group** For more information see CAFA Notice dated 9-26-2017 page 19 above. | **Not set yet** | **For more information write,call or e-mail:****Dowling Aaron Incorporated****Donald R. Fischbach****Mark D. Kruthers,****8080 N. Palm Avenue****Third Floor****Fresno, California 93711****559 432-4500 (Ph.)****Fischbachdfischbach@dowlingaaron.com****mkruthers@dowlingaaron.com** |